

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/734,808	12/12/2000	Carolyn Ramsey Catan	US 000377	2094	
24737	7590 12/01/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			BASHORE, ALAIN L		
P.O. BOX 300 BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3624		
			DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	¥
Advisory Action	09/734,808	RAMSEY CATAN, CARO	DLYN
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alain L. Bashore	3624	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a places the application	a in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Office	ite extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	·		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c)       they are not deemed to place the application in its issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplif	ying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			an .
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-11 and 13-16</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appl	roved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	•		
10. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Olaw Hohan Alain L. Bashore	



Continuation of 2.

Note:

The amendment to the specification has not been entered because it refers to amending a published patent application.

Regarding arguments made of record:

It would have been further obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine using local bio-authentication information of Harada et al because Harada et teaches such for privacy purposes (col 3, lines 10-12) and non-eligible user participation (col 3, lines 40-42).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakano et al to include local sub-credit limit determination because Harada et al teaches local determination of user as important because personal information must be controlled (col 3, lines 8-9) and since Nakano teaches credit sub-limits which is a type of personal information.

HANI M. KAZIMI PRIMARY EXAMINER